

Live, Newsy and Progressive.
SEMI-WEEKLY,
At \$2.00 per Annum

Hopkinsville Kentuckian.

THE LARGEST CIRCULATION.
THE BEST ADVERTISING MEDIUM
Complete Job Office
ATTACHED.

VOLUME XI.

HOPKINSVILLE, CHRISTIAN COUNTY, KY., SEPTEMBER 13, 1889.

NUMBER 74

PUBLISHED TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS,
BY
CHAS. M. MEACHAM.
THOS. E. BARTLEY, Business Manager
Subscription Rates
One copy, one year, strictly cash in ad-
vance
One copy, six months
One copy, three months

ROYAL
BAKING
POWDER
Absolutely Pure.

This powder is made from a mixture of pure, strength and wholesome. More economical than the ordinary kind, and can be sold in competition with the adulterated low test, short weight alum or phosphate powders. Sold only in the ROYAL BRAND POWDER CO., 106 Wall St., N. Y.

BUSINESS CARDS.

DR. F. M. STITES,
Office over Bank of Hopkinsville,
HOPKINSVILLE, - - - KY.
Telephone Residence and Office

A. P. Campbell,
DENTIST,
HOPKINSVILLE, - - KY.
OPERATING A SPECIALTY.
Office over M. Frankel & Sons.

DR. J. L. DULIN,
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON,
McDaniel Block, NEXT DOOR TO
LANE'S CLARK
Hopkinsville, Kentucky.

FORGY & BELL,
LAWYERS,
OFFICE OVER PLASTER'S BANK.
Special attention given to all Busi-
ness. 9-9-ly

HENRY J. STITES,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
HOPKINSVILLE, KY.
Telephone No. 27.

Dr. Wm. M. Fuqua,
PHYSICIAN
—AND—
SURGEON,
Office: Main Street, over National Bank.
4-24-17.

BETHEL
Female College.

(Exclusively for Young Ladies.)
The Fall Session will open on MONDAY,
AUGUST 20, 1889. A lady who has taken a
university course of instruction and been a suc-
cessful teacher, and who has a native German
accent, has been added to the faculty. Mrs.
J. O. Rust will graduate. A special department
of vocal culture added to the musical instruc-
tion heretofore given. For full information
call on or address the President.

J. W. RUST,
Hopkinsville, Ky.

PROGRESSIVE BARBER SHOP
W. M. GRAY, PROPRIETOR.
Ninth Street, nearly opposite the Post Office.
Barber, hair dresser, manicure, and all the
latest fashions. Clean towels. Everything new, neat and
cheap. Hair cutting, shaving and shampooing
done in the very latest style. 12-12-17

Large Sample Rooms. How System Call Bells.
RATES - - - \$2 per Day.
Special Rates by the Week.

SHERWOOD HOUSE
(Under New Management.)
T. C. BRIDWELL, PROP.
Corner 1st & Locust
Streets, Evansville, Ind.

Road Carts! EVERYTHING
ON WHEELS.
Ten percent cheaper
than anybody.
Don't buy before getting our
prices and catalogues.

THE GEO. W. STOCKELL CO.,
Name this paper. HARTSVILLE, TENN.

PILES. SYMPTOMS—Itch-
ing, burning, swelling, and
discharge of blood and
mucus. It is a disease
which is often cured by
the use of the
Swayne's Ointment.
Swayne's Ointment
is a powerful medicine
for the cure of Piles,
Hemorrhoids, and all
the diseases of the
rectum and anus. It
is sold in bottles of
one dollar and five
cents. It is the only
medicine that will
cure Piles in ten days.
Swayne's Ointment
is sold in all drug
stores. It is the only
medicine that will
cure Piles in ten days.
PHOTOGRAPHS!
Before you have your picture taken
and see the character of your work. You
will be satisfied that your picture is equal to
the best. Special attention given to
making life-size portraits by the new
Hood's Process. Fine line of Pictures Frames
Always on hand. CLARENCE ANDERSON,
HARTSVILLE, KY.

SPLENDOR UNRIVALED.

The Gold Dining Hall in the Imperial
Palace at Moscow.

Here, after his coronation, the Em-
peror wears for the first time all the
imperial insignia, dine amidst his
nobles and receives the congratulations
of his foreign ambassadors. This hall,
built by Italian architects in 1491, has
been restored during the present reign
in a simple and archaeologically exact
manner, and primitive
mural paintings having been re-
produced with the aid of ancient descrip-
tions thereof in archaic style by pe-
sant image-painters. Around the pil-
lar in the center of this hall is a series
of shelves forming a buffet, on which
the imperial plate is displayed on
grand days during the visits of the
Tsar. We are sorry to add that the
inestimable treasures of
ancient gold and silver plate which
we marvel at in the glass cases
of the treasury figure on the buffet,
and are polished up for the occasion
by the careless hands or lackeys. In
vain the curators have been warned
that this repeated rubbing diminishes
the value of the objects, and will in the
end materially damage them; the only
answer that they give is: "Our father
the Tsar is coming; the plate must
shine brightly on the buffet."

The display of this collection of
plate has always struck travelers who
have witnessed the magnificence of the
court of the Tsars. Margaret, a Bur-
gundian Captain of the time of Boris
Godunov, in his *Etat de l'Empire de
Russie* (1649), gives a glowing picture
of the rich collection of plate which
was used in the daily service of the
Tsar. The treasury, he says, is full of
all kinds of jewels in great number,
particularly of pearls; for in Russia
more pearls are worn than in all the
rest of Europe. There are
great numbers of gold plates, large
and small, and drinking-cups, be-
sides this an infinite quantity
of silver plate, gilt and not gilt,
as may be judged from the fact
that after the election of Boris Fedor-
ovich, when he gathered his army at
Serpo, during six weeks he feasted al-
most daily ten thousand men each
time, and all were served in silver
plate. Margaret mentions six silver
barrels, a number of big bowls and
basins of silver which required four
men to carry them, each provided
with drinking-cups, the whole of Rus-
sian work. "Also a great number of
silver vessels from Germany, England,
Poland, which are given presents of
princes sent by their ambassadors, or
which have been bought for the rarity
of the workmanship."

Olearius, who visited Russia in 1633,
the narrator of Lord Carlyle's embassy
in 1653, Richard Chancellor, Sir
Jerome Horsey, Dr. Giles Fletcher,
Sir Henry Willeghby, and other
early travelers, all testify to the mar-
velous wealth of the Tsar, and the
quantity of plate displayed on the
"great cupboard," as they
called the buffet around the central
pillar of the banquet-room. Rich-
ard (Chancellor) says: "In the midst of
the chamber stood a table or cupboard
to set plate upon which stood full of
cups of gold, and amongst all the rest
stood four marvelous great
pots, or censures, as they call them,
a good yard and a half high. The
number that dined that day
was two hundred persons, and all were
served in golden vessels."

Sir Henry Willeghby, speaking of
a dinner given by the Tsar, says: "In
the middle of the dining-room was a
table covered with cups of gold. The
number of persons that dined was
about two hundred. All served in ves-
sels of gold, and the gentlemen that
waited were all in cloth of gold."

Theodor Child, in Harper's Magazine

PRETTY WORK-APRONS.

their latest will no doubt be wel-
comed by every housewife.

The revival of the apron as a piece
of dress is a part of modern fashion.
There was a time when the apron was
in danger of being degraded into a
mere accompaniment of kitchen dress,
and the dainty fancy apron of old days
was forgotten. These fancy work-
aprons are dainty and womanly, and
are welcomed by every housewife who
prefers to keep the threads and scraps
in place while she is sewing. A plain
black silk apron of brocade and jet is
the most pretentious form of work-
apron. Simpler, prettier than this is
a white apron of satin, with lines of
drawn work run at intervals the entire
length, with the narrowest finished
drawn ribbon in pale blue or rose color,
and finished at the left side with a
large stylish bow of wide satin ribbon.
Such aprons are merely held in full
shirring on a half belt, and when worn
are planned on either side. A very
dainty white apron is made of fancy
plaided muslin in some pretty
small pattern, and finished with
a deep border of fine lace on the
edge. The pretty hand-made lace
which are crocheted and knitted for
this purpose are as dainty as any
thing. One of the most useful work-
aprons has a pocket the entire width,
to receive the work. It is best made
of India silk in some light, white and
gray-blue or white and rose color, the
these colors will not show the threads.
Take a width of silk, and make a two-
inch hem at the top. About eighteen
inches from top make a fold the same
width. Let the apron extend six or
seven inches further than this, and
turn up the bottom to this depth to
make a pocket to receive the work.
Hem the top of the pocket in a two-
inch hem and run a ribbon in it, and
the narrow fold at the back. Put a
ribbon in the hem at the top. When
the apron is on the pocket at the bot-
tom receives the work, and it remains
there when it is not on the top of the
apron, being folded into this pocket,
and the ribbons run in the folds are
drawn, and the apron becomes a work-
bag, which may be carried on the arm.
A black India silk is frequently made
up by this pattern. Kitchen aprons
should always be large enough to
reach nearly to the bottom of the dress
and cover the skirt at the sides and
back. A plain, straight apron is more
useful than any fancy model for this
purpose. -N. Y. Tribune.

CHINESE BURIAL PLACES.

Queer Modes of Sepulture Practiced in
the Celestial Country.

The dead are for the most part
buried, not as with us, in ground set
apart for that purpose (though one fre-
quently lights upon cemeteries duly
shown with regard to their "lucky
position"), but they are simply laid
down anywhere and everywhere. Few
things strike the traveler more than the
Chinese mode of sepulture. Burial
mounds and coffins—the latter some-
times exposed in all their hideous bare-
ness, at other times wrapped up in
matting, like large chests of tea—meet
the eye at every turn. The Chinaman,
as is well known, maintains a sacred
reverence for the spot where his rela-
tives, and especially his ancestors, have
been buried, and for his native locality
as the religiously-pledged place of his
own ultimate sepulture. With respect
then, to the sacredness of the spot, and
the spot, and with the ministering ser-
vices of the "wind and water spirits,"
is looked upon as anathema. Railways
are considered decidedly uncanny.
There is no denying the fact. But
there is also no denying that the rever-
ence of the Chinese for the graves of
his ancestors is only second to the
reverence for the almighty dollar. This
has been proved times without num-
ber in the neighborhood of the treaty
ports where the foreigner has erected his
own "uncanny" abodes, which frequently
interfere with the "Fengshui"
of burial places, or, as was often the
case, necessitated the removal of the
burial mounds or coffins; but a few dol-
lars to the representative of the family
almost invariably smoothed the diffi-
culty. In a country, then, like China,
where there are fertile plains of vast
extent, and which, therefore, present
few engineering difficulties, in a coun-
try where the cheapest labor in the
world exists in an inexhaustible supply
—labor which, from the wonderful apti-
tude for acquiring proficiency in every
Chinese man, would soon become
skilled labor—the sum as which the
Chinese assume the damage to the graves
of their ancestors would add but a small
amount to the mileage cost of the iron
roads. It may be remembered that a
few years ago a railway about eight
miles in length was laid down between
Shanghai and Woo-Sung, near the
mouth of the Yang-tse-Kiang. It suc-
ceeded extremely well, so well, in fact,
that the provincial authorities be-
came alarmed lest the success might be
used as a precedent and an argument
for further construction, and it was
brought from the British house which
had constructed it; and then, to the
horror of the foreign community, the
rails were torn up and shipped to For-
mosa, on the shores of which they lie
rusting at the present moment. The
railway was carried through one of the
most densely-cultivated districts I can
across in China, but the "Fengshui"
opposition was easily overcome. Be-
sides, it is not impossible that the ver-
million pencil itself may be called in
requisition in the form of an edited
edition in a summary manner with the
question of ancestor compensation—
Blackwood's Magazine.

CRISP SENTENCES.

From *Blackwood's Magazine's* Novel,
"The Open Door."

It is easier to talk than to work.
There are good reasons in prison.
Young people should be ingenious.
A good rider must study his animal.
It would be so beautiful to be needed.
Be intelligent, but on no account
original.
It is a crime for a human soul to sell
himself.
Happily great hate is even rarer
than great love.
Don't run about appealing to peo-
ple's better natures.
The great world people have little
time for sentimental friendship.
How society takes a thing, is more
important than the thing itself.
A fool could make a wise man un-
easy, if he looked at him long enough.
It is as difficult to realize another
man's passion as his rheumatism.
One may be as harmless as an old
mule, but one does not like it thrown
in one's face.
Every body must care for his neigh-
bor's opinion, whether he care for his
neighbor or not.
Lovers may not amount to much,
but they are more interesting than
most things women talk about.
Society does not like a young person
to act like an old maid, or a blue
stocking, or be instructive or superior.
Wealth of the Navajos.

The Navajo tribe of Indians, located
on a reservation of Northwestern New
Mexico, are becoming wealthy in
herds and flocks. The tribe now owns
245,000 horses and ponies; mules, 300,
000; cattle, 3,500; sheep, 830,000; goats,
300,000; burros, 500. There seem to be
no limits to their increase. It is said,
however, that the Navajos are exchang-
ing their herds for cattle, which will
increase their holdings of the latter
kind. The last wool clip amounted to
1,200,000 pounds and besides they sold
300,000 sheep pelts and 100,000 goat
skins. When it is considered that
there are but 6,500 males over eight-
teen years of age it is evident that
these Indians instead of being poor
are pretty well off, at least in this
world's goods. It is claimed by the
Indian Office that the Navajos are
well on the road to civilization, and
that never in their history have they
approached so near the degree of
prosperity that surrounds them to-day.
—Albuquerque Citizen.

To Avoid the Single Tax.

Old Maid—Is there any chance of
Henry George's single tax becoming a
law?
Old Bachelor (suspiciously)—Why
do you ask?
Old Maid (coyly)—Nothing much,
only there is a way for single folks like
us to avoid it.
How?
By—getting—
[But he was gone before she could
get any farther.]—Texas Siftings.

Some people will continue to shake
with chills and try to cure them by
taking Quinine, at the same time run
the chance of losing their hearing.
Buckner's Microbe Killer will cure
chills permanently and take the
Malaria out of your system thorough-
ly. Buckner Leavell, Hopkinsville,
Ky., agent for Christian County.

Mr. Buckner Leavell, our leading
Druggist, always wide awake to the
interest of his patrons and general
public, has just succeeded in securing
the agency for Radan's Microbe
Killer. Owing to the large demand
for this medicine the manufacturers
will not be able to ship his stock for
several days. He has several orders
already for the medicine, so place
your order so you can receive it out
of this first shipment or you may
have to wait for several weeks.

WIGS AND WIG-WEARERS.

The Effect of Distinctive Dress Upon Per-
sons in Authority.

I am a believer in wigs, provided the
wig does not attempt to do and deceive
you into a belief that it is the real nat-
ural covering of the head. It is the
wig's attempt at deceit which makes it
contemptible and ridiculous. When it
boldly says I am a wig, and not a
counterfeit head of hair, it is as re-
spectable as any other head-dress, and
may be quite as becoming. For in-
stance, a handsome King Charles wig
is certainly as becoming as a stove-
pipe hat, and on an official head, a wig
has something imposing. I doubt if
any judge would so sternly typify
Themis with his natural hair as when
he is covered with his wig. Persons
in high offices who personate powers
should not appear in their common
dresses. In my opinion, a judge in
his shirt-sleeves may be as just and
able as one in his robes and wig, but
he will not have the same authority.
Think of a Cardinal in knickerbockers
and a dress coat! Has he not lost half
his impressiveness and influence by
the change of his dress? Dress is as
necessary for the body as language for
the mind. It is, I cannot but think,
a great mistake in America that the
judiciary have no official robes to
distinguish them on the bench, not
only for the dignity which these
give to the office, and for the influ-
ence they exert on the public, but for
the effect they produce on the mind
of the judge himself. A man in official
robes does not feel that he is, to a
certain degree removed from his
ordinary personal relations of common
life; that he becomes a representative
of the office, and bound to its duties.
We admit, in the army and navy, that
dress, uniform and distinctive badges
restrain personalities and give author-
ity, and compel the wearer to a be-
having and conduct appropriate to his
position. So, also, we recognize the ap-
propriateness and impressiveness of
costume in the church. Why is this
not true in all other official positions
in life? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority? Why does it not equally ap-
ply to judges and advocates and all
the officers of a court? American min-
isters at foreign courts are now pre-
hibited from wearing the distinctive
diplomatic dress ordained by custom
of all other nations. But on what au-
thority